DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 239 CS 208 344

AUTHOR Fedler, Fred; Smith, Ron F.
TITLE Survey Reveals Journalism Administrators Prefer Traditional Types of "Research."
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (67th, Gainesville, FL, August 5-8, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Educational Research; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Journalism Education; Research Projects; Scholarly Journals; *Teacher Evaluation; Tenured Faculty
IDENTIFIERS American Society of Journalism Administrators

ABSTRACT

Ninety-four college journalism administrators responded to a questionnaire designed to determine which research activities they felt were most important for tenure evaluation of journalism instructors. All respondents were members of the American Society of Journalism School Administrators. Respondents ranked the importance of 33 activities specific to journalism research. The results indicated that respondents clearly considered some types of research more valuable than others. The types considered most valuable included writing a scholarly book, writing a refereed article for a national journal, and writing a textbook. The activities considered least valuable included editing a newsletter for a nonjournalism group, publishing a photograph in a local newspaper, and appearing on a television program unrelated to a faculty member's teaching assignment. Many of the respondents said some activities were forms of teaching or service, not research. They expressed the greatest disagreement about the more professional or media related activities, such as working part time for a newspaper. Most preferred articles published in refereed, national journals rather than local or nonrefereed journals. They also preferred articles written by a single faculty member, articles related to a faculty member's teaching assignment, and research published in journals rather than presented as a convention paper. (Activity rankings and a copy of the questionnaire are included.) (HTH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED245239

Department of Communication
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Fla. 32816

Phone: 305-275-2681

# Survey Reveals Journalism Administrators Prefer Traditional Types Of "Research"

By Fred Fedler and Ron F. Smith*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Fred Fedler

Ron F. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented to the Newspaper Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication at its 1984 convention at the University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.

*Fedler is a professor and Smith is an assistant professor in the Department of Communication at the University of Central Florida, Orlando.

CS 208 344

Survey Reveals Journalism Administrators

Prefer Traditional Types Of "Research"

Are good researchers good teachers?

Also, what types of research do administrators in the field of journalism and mass communication consider most valuable?

This is the first of three studies that will attempt to answer those questions. As a first step, this study will identify the types of research preferred by administrators in the field of journalism and mass communication. The second study, to be conducted at a single institution, will compare faculty members' accomplishments in the field of research with their performance as teachers. The third study also will compare faculty members' performance as researchers and teachers, but at a national cross-section of universities.

Traditionally, faculty members employed by the nation's colleges and universities have been evaluated in three areas: (1) teaching, (2) research, and (3) service. But of those three areas, research seems to be the most important. The rewards granted faculty members--tenure, promotions, raises and merit pay--seem to depend primarily upon excellence in research, and only secondarily upon excellence in teaching.

Fedler and Counts found that 75% of the faculty members in the field of journalism and mass communication agreed that tenure at their institutions was related to research, but only 52.6% agreed that tenure also was related to teaching.[1] Similarly, Rossman found that, "Other than academic rank, which are closely related to salary, that variable which showed the highest relationship to salary was publication productivity.[2]

Despite its importance, "research" has never been clearly defined. More than 3,200 four-year colleges and universities offer classes in the United States, and definitions of research vary from one institution to another, and even from one department to another within each institution.

Some faculty members employed by those institutions seem opposed to any evaluations of their research. Others argue that research is too complex and diverse to be defined. Still others disagree about the criteria that should be used.

Administrators might count the number of articles published by a faculty member. Or, they might try to evaluate the articles' quality, or the quality of the journals that publish those articles. As another alternative, administrators might seek peer ratings or count the number of times a faculty member's articles have been cited by other researchers.

Many administrators seem to be interested primarily in the number of articles on a faculty member's publication list. But that practice favors faculty members who produce a large quantity (rather than a high quality) of research. Commenting on that problem, Levesque noted that, "The 'Publish or Perish' slogan is pervasive because it cleverly tells part of the truth--the contemptuous hint that anything will do, as long as it gets into print."[3]

Other evaluation techniques also involve some difficulties. For example: attempts to evaluate an article's quality may be subjective. Peer ratings also are subjective and may be difficult to obtain.

Stallings and Singhal assigned numerical values to different types of research: 15 points for a book, 12 for a co-authored book, 9 for an edited book, 3 for an article, 2 for a co-authored article, 3 for a technical report, 2 for a co-authored technical report, 2 for a book review, 1 for a co-authored book review, and 5 for a dissertation.[4] The numerical values provided more credit for the most desirable

types of publications. However, the selection of those numerical values seems to have been arbitrary.

Using a similar methodology, Cole and Bowers rated the research productivity of 171 U.S. schools and departments of journalism "according to one objective index of research contributions: productivity of articles."[5]

Cole and Bowers limited their study to six journals selected "on the basis of their generally recognized importance in the field of journalism and mass communication." They assigned a weight of "1" to a research note, "2" to a full article, and "6" to a monograph. They gave fractional credits for articles that had been co-authored: "A two-author article gave each author .50 credit, a three-author article .33 credit, and so on."

Cole and Bowers found that faculty members at the University of Wisconsin were most productive. "Far behind, but close to each other, were Minnesota and Iowa." In addition, Cole and Bowers also identified the most productive individuals. But again, their study was limited to the articles published by six journals.

A second issue adds to the need for better evaluations of faculty research. Many academicians believe that the faculty members who engage in research excel as teachers. Seldin explains, "Some teachers maintain that they cannot be stimulating and up-to-date in their classrooms unless they are personally engaged in research in their favorite areas."[6]

Jencks and Riesman add: "Teachers cannot remain stimulating unless they also continue to learn....When a teacher stops doing it, he begins to repeat himself and eventually loses touch with both the young and the world around him."[7] Jencks and Riesman also insist that: "Those who do not publish usually feel they have not learned anything worth communicating to adults. This means they have not learned much worth communicating to the young either."[8]

Other advocates of faculty research argue that the research expands faculty members' knowledge of their fields and enables those faculty members to test their

ideas, not just in a classroom, but before their scholarly peers. By publishing that research, faculty members also can enhance their reputations nationally and even internationally.

Other academicians insist that there is no relationship between teaching and research. Some even warn that research discourages good teaching--that faculty members may neglect their classes so they can devote more time to research.

Academicians skeptical of the relationship between research and teaching add that the skills needed to excel as a researcher are different from the skills needed to excel as a teacher. Moreover, faculty members may be unlikely to discuss their research with students because most research is more specialized than the content of most classes.

Studies conducted in other fields have generally supported the skeptics' viewpoint. The studies have found little or no relationship between research and teaching. Typically, Eble found: "Some good researchers are good teachers; some good researchers are poor teachers; some poor researchers are good teachers; some poor researchers are poor teachers; the majority of both researchers and teachers are mediocre, but in different combinations and ways."[9]

Similarly, Dent and Lewis concluded: "...universities which select faculty members solely on the basis of scholarship get a group that is average in teaching. These faculty members will be neither inferior nor superior, as a group, to non-productive colleagues."[10]

Linsky and Straus also found that research does not seem to be closely related to good teaching. Nevertheless, their research implies that "universities that hire faculty primarily according to research potential will get a greater overall return for their money." Linsky and Straus explained that, "...such research-producing faculty are on average at least as good teachers as those not engaging in research."[11]

Regardless of the relationship between research and teaching, the problem of defining and evaluating research is becoming increasingly important. If faculty members

are rewarded primarily for their research, then administrators must be able to properly evaluate that research and to explain their evaluations to the faculty members involved. If the administrators are unable to do so, faculty members receiving poor evaluations will complain that the process is too subjective and unfair.

The previous research seems to be especially inadequate for faculty members in the field of journalism and mass communication. Three factors support that contention:

FIRST, few of the previous studies have involved faculty members in the field of journalism and mass communication. Yet faculty members in that field might argue that their research activities are unusually diverse, and that those activities may involve much more than pure theory and experimentation.

SECOND, most of the previous studies have emphasized the number of articles produced by faculty members, without regard to the quality of those articles. Some studies have weighed some types of articles more heavily than others, but the assignment of those weights has been subjective, based primarily upon the judgment of one or two individuals. Also, some studies have been limited to the articles published by only a few journals.

THIRD, faculty members in the field of journalism and mass communication often insist that, to be good teachers, they must be experienced professionals. Many try to keep their professional skills up-to-date by working part time for the media or by periodically spending a summer or sabbatical on the staff of a newspaper or radio or television station. If their assertions are correct, then the faculty members who engage in those professional or media-related activities and research also should be better teachers than their less active colleagues. Furthermore, some of those faculty members may want their professional activities accepted as types of research, or as substitutes for that research.

Because of the field's diversity, this study will examine 33 different types of activities or research, including some unique to journalism and communication. In addition, it will rely upon the collective judgment of dozens of administrators from institutions throughout the United States.

## Methodology

The authors mailed a one-page questionnaire to all 147 members of the American Society of Journalism School Administrators. The authors selected the administrators because most would be familiar with the evaluation criteria at their institutions and would use those criteria to evaluate faculty members.

The questionnaire listed 33 activities and asked respondents to rate each activity, using "your institution's definitions of research for year-end evaluations, tenure, and promotions." The rating scale ranged from "1" (least valuable) to "10" (most valuable). Respondents who did not consider an activity a form of research were instructed to rate that activity "0."

Many of the activities listed on the questionnaire involved traditional types of research, such as: delivering a convention paper; writing a journal article; or writing, editing, or reviewing a book. In addition, the questionnaire listed several activities of particular concern to faculty members in the field of journalism and mass communication. Those activities included: publishing a photograph, working part time for a newspaper, and producing a radio or television program.

Still other activities included: applying for a grant, editing a newsletter, serving as a convention discussant, giving a speech, and appearing on a television program.

Several activities were divided into more specific subcategories. For example: respondents were asked to rate four activities involving books: (1) writing a college textbook, (2) writing a scholarly book unlikely to be used as a textbook, (3) writing a popular book for the general public, and (4) editing a book of readings.

Respondents also were asked to compare the value of articles in national refereed publications, such as Journalism Quarterly, with the articles published by: (1) national journalism magazines such as The Quill, (2) popular national magazines not about journalism, and (3) local and regional magazines.

Finally, other questions asked about articles that were co-authored, about grant applications that were successful and unsuccessful, and about activities related and unrelated to a faculty member's teaching assignment (A copy of the entire questionnaire appears in Appendix A.).

## Results

Ninety-four usable questionnaires (63.9%) were returned to the authors. Six additional questionnaires were returned blank; however, several of the persons who returned those questionnaires attached notes of explanation.

The respondents clearly considered some types of research more valuable than others (See Table I). The types of research considered most valuable included: writing a scholarly book, which received a mean score of 8.39; writing a refereed article for a national journal, 8.25; and writing a college textbook, 7.42. By comparison, books for the general public ranked 7th, and edited books of readings ranked 11th.

Viewed from another perspective, 49 respondents rated the publication of a scholarly book "10," the highest possible score. However, only 30 respondents gave that rating to a textbook, 14 to a popular book and 2 to an edited book of readings.

Forty respondents also gave the highest rating, a "10," to the publication of an article in a national refereed journal.

The three activities considered least valuable included: editing a newsletter for a non-journalism group, 2.24; publishing a photograph in a local newspaper, 2.19; and appearing on a television program unrelated to a faculty member's teaching assignment, 1.97.

Only six of the 33 activities were classified as research by all 94 respondents. Those activities included: (1) writing a scholarly book, (2) presenting a paper at a refereed national convention, (3) co-authoring an article for a refereed national journal, (4) writing an article for a refereed regional journal, (5) writing an article for a journalism magazine such as The Quill, and (6) presenting a paper at a state or regional convention. One respondent marked the publication of a single-author article in a national refereed journal "0" (not a type of research).

Thirty or more respondents objected to calling three activities types of research: (1) working part time for a newspaper, (2) publishing a photograph in a local newspaper, and (3) appearing on a television program unrelated to a faculty member's teaching assignment.

The respondents consistently preferred activities related to teaching assignments. Typically, they ranked the publication of a newspaper article related to a faculty member's teaching assignment 16th, but a newspaper article unrelated to the teaching assignment 28th. Similarly, several respondents said they would consider the publication of photographs meritorious "only for a photo teacher."

One respondent explained: "A person who teaches magazine article writing could receive tenure and promotion to associate professor on the basis of success as a free lance magazine writer (called creative activity here, not research), and a broadcaster could be tenured for television programs written and produced. Both must demonstrate a distinguished national reputation for promotion to professor. For example, the broadcaster would have to provide programs for PBS...."

Finally, Table I shows no major changes occur in the mean scores and rankings when respondents who rated an activity "0" (not a type of research) are excluded from the tabulations.

Several respondents noted that the faculty members at their institutions are required to engage in "research or creative activities." Moreover, several listed

additional activities that they believe would help fulfill that requirement. Again, faculty members at other institutions may disagree about the activities' value; nevertheless, those activities include:

*Working as a consultant

*Working on an advanced degree

*Attending a seminar or workshop

*Exhibiting a creative work, such as a film

*Being awarded a fellowship, such as a Fulbright

*Serving as an expert witness; an officer in AEJMC; a judge for a professional contest; or on a variety of other regional, state, and national committees.

Several respondents added that they are trying to expand their institutions' definitions of research so faculty members can obtain more credit for professional journalistic activities. One of those respondents explained: "...we are in the process of trying to broaden those definitions somewhat, especially to take greater account of creative work, but also to recognize writing that reflects research efforts, but presented in some forum other than 'traditional' scholarly journals."

However an even greater number of respondents complained that the list of 33 activities was already too large--that many of the activities were types of teaching or service, not research. For example: two respondents said writing a college textbook is an "extension of teaching" or "evidence of teaching, not research."

Similarly, 14 respondents said they would not consider successful grant applications "research," and 26 said they would not consider unsuccessful grant applications "research." Several respondents questioned the application purpose; for example, whether the grants would be spent on equipment or research. One of the respondents said he would give a grant application a "0," but that, "The research supported by the grant is a different matter."

Another respondent added: "Content is critical. Editing, writing, speaking, grantsmanship, cannot be associated with serious research simply by implication. The activities listed may well be valuable to classroom performance, but the majority of them are completely unrelated to research as I understand it. Even the writing of a book need not be a research exercise...."

Table II shows that respondents expressed the greatest disagreement about the value of nontraditional types of research: about the more professional or media-related activities.

Respondents expressed the greatest agreement about the value of articles written for journalism magazines such as The Quill. They expressed the greatest disagreement about the value of part-time work for a newspaper. Again, it does not seem to matter whether the respondents who ranked an activity "0" (not a form of research) are excluded from the tabulations.

Briefly, other interesting highlights include:

*Thirty-one respondents did not consider working part time for a newspaper research, yet 9 others rated it "10," the highest possible score.

*Five respondents did not consider writing a book for the general public a form of research, yet 14 others rated it "10."

*Ten respondents did not consider serving as a discussant at a convention a form of research; moreover, none rated it a "10."

Respondents who returned blank forms generally explained that their evaluations of a faculty member's work would depend more upon its quality. One of those respondents said, "Most of the questions require generalizations I am simply unable to make." He noted, for example, that, "Articles appearing in Columbia Journalism Review or The Quill vary substantially in their quality as scholarship."

A second respondent added: "Individual cases must be judged. An article in Quill could be based on true or pure research and therefore be a 10; it could be a thoughtful piece...and be a 7 or 8; or it could be Quill's usual tripe and be a 0. It all depends. The quality of the meeting also must be judged. Some AEJMC divisions have no real research papers, and others are highly competitive."

Still another respondent declared: "...it is unwise, I think, to place absolute values on any of these items. We try to give credit for getting up to bat (entering the publications game) but also for what the person did at bat (quality)...."

Thus, faculty members in the field of journalism and mass communication engage in a variety of activities that might be considered research but do not involve publication. The availability of those options may help explain why a recent study found that 22% of the field's faculty members had not published a single article during the last five years and why 54% had not published an article in a national refereed publication such as Journalism Quarterly.[12] Their institutions may allow those faculty members to engage in other types of research and creative activities.

Despite the options, this study found that most administrators prefer traditional forms of research, as opposed to more professional types of media work. Even more specifically, administrators preferred articles published in journals that are: (1) national rather than local, and (2) refereed rather than non-refereed. They also prefer articles written by a single faculty member, articles related to a faculty member's teaching assignment, and research published in journals rather than presented in convention papers.

However, the differences are not great. For example: a paper presented at a national convention received a mean score of 6.99, compared to a score of 5.87 for a paper presented at a state or regional convention. Moreover, the rankings rarely

seem to reflect the amount of work required to produce a piece of research. A scholarly book (which may require years to produce) received a mean score of 8.39, while a refereed article (which may require only a few months to produce) received a mean score of 8.25. A textbook (which also may require years to produce) received an even lower score: 7.42.

The authors failed to ask about several variables that might affect or help explain the results. For example: there may be a greater emphasis on the traditional types of research at older, larger public universities, and especially at universities with major graduate programs. Also, the faculty members at those universities may enjoy lighter teaching loads so they have more time to engage in research. Conversely, smaller schools--especially schools with strong professional programs--may be more willing to accept a broader range of activities, including some media work, as research.

Several respondents complained that this study placed too much emphasis upon the quantity of a faculty member's research and not enough emphasis upon its quality. Although that criticism has some merit, it may not be entirely accurate. The 94 respondents clearly considered some types of research more valuable (of a higher quality) than others. And the numerical values they assigned to the 33 activities reflect their assessment of its quality.

Also, as a generality, some publications are more rigorous than others. They receive more manuscripts and subject them to peer review. Similarly, most academicians would probably agree that writing a typical book requires more scholarship--more research, thought, effort, and writing ability--than writing a typical book review. And a typical paper presented at a refereed national convention would have to be more competitive and would receive more recognition than a typical paper presented at a local conference. Thus, the study and the list of 33 activities did include some indications of quality.

Finally, one respondent commented on an issue to be pursued in the second phase of this study: the relationship between teaching and research. He said: "In journalism and mass communications, I know many fine teachers who do not participate in the activities you list. And I know many who do. Those who do not find the road to promotion, tenure and merit raises rocky--that is where the difference is significant--not in the classroom."

## Summary

The authors mailed a one-page questionnaire to all 147 members of the American Society of Journalism School Administrators. The questionnaire listed 33 activities, and each respondent was asked to rate the activities on a scale of "1" (least valuable) to "10" (most valuable).

The respondents clearly considered some types of research more valuable than others. The types of research considered most valuable included: writing a scholarly book, writing a refereed article for a national journal, and writing a textbook. The activities considered least valuable included: editing a newsletter for a non-journalism group, publishing a photograph in a local newspaper, and appearing on a television program unrelated to a faculty member's teaching assignment.

Many of the respondents said some activities were forms of teaching or service, not research. They expressed the greatest disagreement about the more professional or media-related activities, such as working part time for a newspaper.

Most respondents preferred articles published in journals that are national rather than local and refereed rather than non-refereed. They also preferred articles written by a single faculty member, articles related to a faculty member's teaching assignment, and research published in journals rather than presented in convention papers. However, many of the differences were small, and the mean scores did not seem to reflect the amount of work required to produce a particular type of research.

Footnotes

[1]Fred Fedler and Tim Counts, "National J-faculty survey reveals job likes, dislikes," Journalism Educator, Autumn 1982, p. 4.

[2]Jack E. Rossman, "Teaching, Publication, and Rewards at a Liberal Arts College," Improving College and University Teaching, Autumn 1976, p. 239.

[3]George A. Levesque, "Publish, Yea, Even If It Be Thy Doctoral Dissertation," The Chronicle Of Higher Education, Sept. 19, 1977, p. 32.

[4]William M. Stallings and Sushila Singhal, "Some Observations on the Relationships between Research Productivity and Student Evaluations of Courses and Teaching," Research Report #274, University of Illinois, 1969, p. 4.

[5]Richard R. Cole and Thomas A. Bowers, "Research Article Productivity of U.S. Journalism Faculties," Journalism Quarterly, 50 (Summer 1973), p. 246.

[6]Peter Seldin, Successful Faculty Evaluation Programs (Crugers, N.Y.: Coventry Press, 1980), p. 14.

[7]Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968), p. 532.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Kenneth Eble, The Craft of Teaching (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977), pp. 18-19.

[10]Preston L. Dent and Donald J. Lewis, "The Relationship Between Teaching Effectiveness And Measures of Research Quality," Educational Research Quarterly, Fall 1976, p. 15.

[11]Arnold S. Linsky and Murray A. Straus, "Student Evaluations, Research Productivity, and Eminence of College Faculty," Journal of Higher Education, 46 (Jan./Feb. 1975), p. 100.

[12]Fred Fedler and Tim Counts, "Professors' Satisfaction With Jobs Related To Academic Ranks," paper presented to the Mass Communication and Society Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, annual convention in Athens, Ohio, July 1982, p. 9.

Table I

Ranking Of 33 Activities

In The Order Of Their Perceived Value As Research

| Ranks And Activities | Means | Number Objecting To Categorization As "Research" | Percent Objecting | Ranks And Means Excluding All Zeroes | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Scholarly book | 8.39 | 0 | 0 | 1. | 8.39 |
| 2. National, refereed article | 8.25 | 1 | 1.1 | 2. | 8.34 |
| 3. College textbook | 7.42 | 2 | 2.1 | 3. | 7.56 |
| 4. National convention paper | 6.99 | 0 | 0 | 4. | 6.99 |
| 5. Co-author national, refereed article | 6.87 | 0 | 0 | 5. | 6.87 |
| 6. Regional refereed article | 6.38 | 0 | 0 | 8. | 6.34 |
| 7. Popular book | 6.22 | 5 | 5.3 | 7. | 6.57 |
| 8. Article in national journalism magazine | 6.08 | 0 | 0 | 9. | 6.07 |
| 9. Regional convention paper | 5.87 | 0 | 0 | 10. | 5.87 |
| 10. Successful grant application | 5.62 | 14 | 14.9 | 6. | 6.67 |
| 11. Edited book of readings | 5.33 | 4 | 4.3 | 14. | 5.34 |
| 12. Article in popular national mag. related to teaching | 5.27 | 3 | 3.2 | 12. | 5.55 |
| 13. Speech related to teaching | 4.87 | 10 | 10.6 | 13. | 5.41 |
| 14. Article in regional mag., not refereed | 4.75 | 5 | 5.3 | 19. | 4.75 |
| 15. Book review in national, refereed publication | 4.58 | 7 | 7.4 | 17. | 4.95 |
| 16. Newspaper article related to teaching | 4.20 | 9 | 9.6 | 21. | 4.65 |
| 17. Article in popular national mag. unrelated to teaching | 4.07 | 12 | 12.8 | 20. | 4.67 |
| 18. Discussant at convention | 4.04 | 10 | 10.6 | 22. | 4.53 |
| 19. Book review in regional, refereed publication | 3.86 | 8 | 8.5 | 26. | 4.22 |
| 20. Part-time work for a newspaper | 3.84 | 31 | 33.0 | 11. | 5.78 |
| 21. Work as radio/TV reporter | 3.78 | 25 | 26.6 | 15. | 5.21 |
| 22. Photo in national magazine | 3.62 | 26 | 27.7 | 16. | 5.09 |
| 23. Appearance on TV show, related to teaching | 3.53 | 20 | 21.3 | 23. | 4.51 |
| 24. Editing newsletter for J-group | 3.44 | 20 | 21.3 | 25. | 4.39 |
| 25. Working part time in industry | 3.29 | 30 | 31.9 | 18. | 4.89 |
| 26. Reviewer for textbook publisher | 3.19 | 20 | 21.3 | 27. | 4.07 |
| 27. Photo in regional publication | 3.02 | 29 | 30.9 | 24. | 4.44 |
| 28. Newspaper article unrelated to teaching | 2.74 | 22 | 23.4 | 30. | 3.60 |
| 29. Unsuccessful grant application | 2.73 | 26 | 27.7 | 28. | 3.84 |
| 30. Speech unrelated to teaching | 2.70 | 25 | 26.6 | 29. | 3.70 |
| 31. Editing newsletter for non-journalism group | 2.24 | 29 | 30.9 | 32. | 3.27 |
| 32. Photo in local newspaper | 2.19 | 34 | 36.2 | 31. | 3.49 |
| 33. Appearance on TV show, unrelated to teaching | 1.97 | 35 | 37.2 | 33. | 3.18 |

Table II

Rank Ordering By Variance

(Table Shows Disagreement About Their Perceived Value)

| Ranks And Activities | Variance ~~Means~~ | Ranks And ~~Means~~ Variance Excluding All Zeroes |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Part time work for newspaper | 12.46 | 1. 7.56 |
| 2. Successful grant application | 12.03 | 2. 7.23 |
| 3. Photo in national magazine | 10.13 | 3. 6.69 |
| 3. Work as radio/TV reporter | 10.13 | 14. 4.85 |
| 5. Working part time in industry | 8.89 | 9. 5.35 |
| 6. Photo in regional publication | 8.20 | 7. 5.73 |
| 7. Popular book | 8.11 | 4. 6.25 |
| 8. Speech related to teaching | 7.73 | 8. 5.52 |
| 9. Appearance on TV show, related to teaching | 7.22 | 14. 4.85 |
| 10. Editing newsletter for J-group | 7.00 | 18. 4.72 |
| 11. College textbook | 6.89 | 5. 5.81 |
| 12. Article in popular national mag. unrelated to teaching | 6.69 | 14. 4.85 |
| 13. Reviewer for textbook publisher | 6.40 | 23. 4.57 |
| 14. Newspaper article related to teaching | 6.25 | 17. 4.81 |
| 15. Discussant at convention | 6.19 | 19. 4.71 |
| 16. Book review in national, refereed publication | 5.99 | 22. 4.61 |
| 17. Unsuccessful grant application | 5.97 | 29. 4.10 |
| 18. Co-author national refereed article | 5.81 | 5. 5.81 |
| 19. National, refereed article | 5.68 | 12. 4.98 |
| 20. Newspaper article, unrelated to teaching | 5.67 | 27. 4.33 |
| 20. Photo in local newspaper | 5.67 | 24. 4.50 |
| 22. Speech unrelated to teaching | 5.58 | 31. 3.91 |
| 23. Edited book of readings | 5.33 | 26. 4.34 |
| 23. Regional refereed article | 5.33 | 10. 5.33 |
| 25. Book review in regional, refereed publication | 5.32 | 28. 4.27 |
| 26. Article in popular national mag. related to teaching | 5.23 | 25. 4.41 |
| 27. Scholarly book | 5.00 | 11. 5.00 |
| 27. Editing newsletter for non-journalism group | 5.00 | 32. 3.91 |
| 29. Regional convention paper | 4.97 | 13. 4.97 |
| 30. Article in regional mag., not refereed | 4.36 | 20. 4.65 |
| 30. National convention paper | 4.36 | 20. 4.65 |
| 32. Appearance on TV show, unrelated to teaching | 4.05 | 33. 2.68 |
| 33. Article in national journalism magazine | 3.96 | 30. 3.96 |

Appendix A

Research Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS: We would like to know which types of research you consider most valuable. Using a scale of "1" (least valuable) to "10" (most valuable), please rate the following types of research. If you do not consider an activity "research," please rate it "0." Use your institution's definition of research for year-end evaluations, tenure and promotions.

The form is anonymous, and you can use the enclosed, stamped and addressed envelope to return your ratings to the authors: Fred Fedler and Ron Smith, Department of Communication, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Fla. 32816.

1._____Writing a college textbook
2._____Writing a scholarly book unlikely to be used as a textbook
3._____Writing a book for the general public
4._____Editing a book of readings

5._____Article in a national, refereed (peer reviewed) publication, such as Journalism Quarterly, written entirely by a faculty member at your institution
6._____Article in a national, refereed publication but with two co-authors
7._____Article in a national journalism magazine, not refereed, such as Quill
8._____Article about a professor's teaching area in a popular national magazine
9._____Article not about the professor's teaching area in a popular national magazine
10._____Article in a state or regional, refereed publication
11._____Article in a state or regional journalism magazine, not refereed

12._____Paper presented at a national convention
13._____Paper presented at a state or regional convention
14._____Serving as a discussant or on a panel at a convention

15._____Newspaper article (editorial, review, feature story, column) related to a professor's teaching area
16._____Newspaper article (editorial, etc.) not related to the professor's teaching area

17._____Giving a speech, seminar or workshop about a professor's teaching area
18._____Giving a speech, seminar or workshop not about the professor's teaching area

19._____Working as a part-time staff member for a newspaper
20._____Working part-time in a journalistic capacity for a private firm or industry

21._____Writing or editing a newsletter for a journalism group
22._____Writing or editing a newsletter for a non-journalism group

23._____Applying, successfully, for a grant
24._____Applying, unsuccessfully, for a grant

25._____Participating in a radio or television program about the teaching area
26._____Participating in a radio or television program not about the teaching area
27._____Serving as a reporter or producer for a radio or television program

28._____Having a photograph appear in a national magazine
29._____Having a photograph appear in a state or regional magazine
30._____Having a photograph appear in a local newspaper

31._____Writing a book review for a national refereed publication
32._____Writing a book review for a state or regional refereed publication
33._____Serving as a reviewer for a textbook publisher

34._____Other (Please specify)_____